

Inverse Chapman-Enskog Derivation of the Thermohydrodynamic Lattice-BGK Model for the Ideal Gas *

Bruce M. Boghosian

Center for Computational Science, Boston University,
3 Cummington Street, Boston, Massachusetts 02215, U.S.A.

bruceb@bu.edu

Peter V. Coveney

Schlumberger Cambridge Research,
High Cross, Maddingley Road, Cambridge CB3 0E5, U.K.

(February 4, 2008)

A thermohydrodynamic lattice-BGK model for the ideal gas was derived by Alexander et al. in 1993, and generalized by McNamara et al. in the same year. In these works, particular forms for the equilibrium distribution function and the transport coefficients were posited and shown to work, thereby establishing the *sufficiency* of the model. In this paper, we rederive the model from a minimal set of assumptions, and thereby show that the forms assumed for the shear and bulk viscosities are also *necessary*, but that the form assumed for the thermal conductivity is not. We derive the most general form allowable for the thermal conductivity, and the concomitant generalization of the equilibrium distribution. In this way, we show that it is possible to achieve variable (albeit density-dependent) Prandtl number even within a single-relaxation-time lattice-BGK model. We accomplish this by demanding analyticity of the third moments and traces of the fourth moments of the equilibrium distribution function. The method of derivation demonstrates that certain undesirable features of the model – such as the unphysical dependence of the viscosity coefficients on temperature – cannot be corrected within the scope of lattice-BGK models with constant relaxation time.

I. INTRODUCTION

A thermohydrodynamic lattice BGK model for the ideal gas was derived by Alexander et al. in 1993 [1]. In the same year, McNamara and coworkers [2] generalized this model to include different relaxation times for the stress and the energy, thereby allowing adjustment of the Prandtl number. These analyses assumed particular forms for the equilibrium distribution function, took the transport coefficients to be linear in the internal energy I and independent of the density ρ , and carried out a Chapman-Enskog analysis to show that these choices yielded the desired thermohydrodynamic equations. In this way, the *sufficiency* of the thermohydrodynamic lattice-BGK model was established. In this paper, we rederive this model from the demand that the moments of the equilibrium distribution be analytic. We show that the forms assumed for the shear and bulk viscosities in earlier works are *necessary* as well as sufficient, but that the form assumed for the thermal conductivity k is not. We derive the most general possible form for k , as well as the alteration that this incurs in the form of the equilibrium distribution function, and we show that this enables some adjustment of Prandtl number even within a single-relaxation-time lattice-BGK model.

We demonstrate this by carrying out an “inverse Chapman-Enskog analysis”; that is, we assume only that the first three moments and the trace of the fourth moment of the equilibrium distribution function exist and are analytic, and we demand that the resulting macroscopic equations be identical to the usual ones of

*To appear in *International Journal of Modern Physics C* (1998)

thermohydrodynamics. We then work backwards to find the requirements imposed upon the equilibrium and the transport coefficients. As shall be shown, this process determines the derivatives of the third moments and the traces of the fourth moments of the equilibrium distribution function with respect to the conserved densities. Analyticity of the moments then requires that their mixed second derivatives be symmetric with respect to the order of differentiation.

It is sometimes glibly stated that this “inverse Chapman-Enskog” approach to deriving lattice Boltzmann models is capable of dealing with essentially any hydrodynamic equations whatsoever. This work shows that this is definitely *not* the case. In fact, as we shall see, even the problem for the ideal gas is hugely overdetermined. Such overdetermination is a serious problem with lattice BGK models in spite of the freedom that one has in choosing different lattices and different sets of particle velocities. Indeed, within the context of a lattice BGK model for the usual equations of viscous thermohydrodynamics, with constant relaxation parameter, this paper will demonstrate that *no* choice of lattice or of velocity set will yield viscosities that vary as the square root of temperature, as is usually desired. This follows from nothing more than the requirement that the moments of the equilibrium distribution be analytic. It may be possible to circumvent this restriction by other generalizations of the BGK methodology – for example, by introducing a particular dependence of the relaxation parameter on the hydrodynamic densities – but this has yet to be demonstrated.

II. THE CHAPMAN-ENSKOG ANALYSIS

As usual, we assume that the mass, momentum and kinetic energy densities are given by the first three moments of the discrete-velocity distribution function,

$$\begin{aligned}\rho &= \sum_i f_i = \sum_i f_i^{(0)} \\ \mathbf{p} &= \sum_i \mathbf{c}_i f_i = \sum_i \mathbf{c}_i f_i^{(0)} \\ \mathcal{E} &= \sum_i \frac{c_i^2}{2} f_i = \sum_i \frac{c_i^2}{2} f_i^{(0)},\end{aligned}$$

where $f_i^{(0)}$ is the equilibrium distribution. The kinetic equation can be written

$$f_i(\mathbf{x} + \epsilon \mathbf{c}_i, t + \epsilon \Delta t) = f_i(\mathbf{x}, t) + \Omega_i, \quad (1)$$

where we have denoted the lattice vectors by $\mathbf{c}_i$, and the time step by Δt which is equal to unity in natural lattice units. We have also introduced the gradient expansion parameter ϵ which will aid in the Chapman-Enskog analysis, and the collision operator Ω_i which is required to conserve mass, momentum and kinetic energy

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_i \Omega_i &= 0 \\ \sum_i \mathbf{c}_i \Omega_i &= 0 \\ \sum_i \frac{c_i^2}{2} \Omega_i &= 0.\end{aligned}$$

The assertion that the energy is purely kinetic will lead us inevitably to an ideal gas equation of state.

Throughout this work, we assume that the collision operator is of BGK form,

$$\Omega_i = \frac{1}{\tau} \left(f_i^{(0)} - f_i \right), \quad (2)$$

where τ is a characteristic collisional relaxation time. As noted above, this model was generalized in subsequent work by McNamara et al. [2] to include more than one relaxation time and thereby allow for variable

Prandtl number. In this work, we adhere to the original form with a single relaxation time. We shall show that some variation of Prandtl number is possible even in this case. We emphasize, however, that there is nothing preventing the application of our methods to the more general case of multiple relaxation times, and that such application may uncover still more general lattice-BGK models for that case as well.

To carry out the Chapman-Enskog analysis, we first solve Eq. (2) for the full distribution function

$$\begin{aligned}
f_i &= f_i^{(0)} - \tau \Omega_i \\
&= f_i^{(0)} - \tau [f_i(\mathbf{x} + \epsilon \mathbf{c}_i, t + \epsilon \Delta t) - f_i(\mathbf{x}, t)] \\
&= f_i^{(0)} - \tau \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \frac{\epsilon^\ell}{\ell!} (\partial_t + \mathbf{v}_i \cdot \nabla)^\ell f_i \\
&= f_i^{(0)} - \tau \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \frac{\epsilon^\ell}{\ell!} (\hat{D}_i)^\ell f_i
\end{aligned}$$

where $\hat{D}_i \equiv \partial_t + \mathbf{v}_i \cdot \nabla$ and $\mathbf{v}_i \equiv \mathbf{c}_i / \Delta t$, and where Eq. (1) was used to get from the first line to the second. Next, we establish multiple time scales by ordering $\hat{D}_i$ as follows:

$$\hat{D}_i = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \epsilon^{k-1} \hat{D}_i^{(k)},$$

where

$$\hat{D}_i^{(k)} \equiv \partial_{t_k} + \mathbf{v}_i \cdot \nabla.$$

Here t_1 is the fastest time scale, t_2 is slower, etc. This results in

$$f_i = \left[1 + \tau \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \frac{\epsilon^\ell}{\ell!} \left(\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \epsilon^{k-1} \hat{D}_i^{(k)} \right)^\ell \right]^{-1} f_i^{(0)},$$

and we can expand this in ϵ to obtain

$$f_i = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \epsilon^k f_i^{(k)},$$

where to $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
f_i^{(1)} &= -\tau \hat{D}_i^{(1)} f_i^{(0)} \\
f_i^{(2)} &= -\tau \left[\hat{D}_i^{(1)} - \left(\tau - \frac{1}{2} \right) (\hat{D}_i^{(1)})^2 \right] f_i^{(0)},
\end{aligned}$$

or, in expanded form

$$f_i^{(1)} = -\tau (\partial_{t_1} + \mathbf{v}_i \cdot \nabla) f_i^{(0)} \tag{3}$$

$$f_i^{(2)} = -\tau \left[(\partial_{t_2} + \mathbf{v}_i \cdot \nabla) - \left(\tau - \frac{1}{2} \right) (\partial_{t_1} + \mathbf{v}_i \cdot \nabla)^2 \right] f_i^{(0)}. \tag{4}$$

III. THE FORM OF THE EQUILIBRIUM DISTRIBUTION

To proceed, we adopt notation for the first five completely symmetric tensor moments of the *equilibrium* distribution function. Since the local equilibrium is entirely determined by the conserved quantities, all of these moments must be functions of the three conserved densities, thus

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho &= \sum_i f_i^{(0)} \\
p_\alpha &= \sum_i c_{i\alpha} f_i^{(0)} \\
Q_{\alpha\beta}(\rho, \mathbf{p}, \mathcal{E}) &= \sum_i c_{i\alpha} c_{i\beta} f_i^{(0)} \\
R_{\alpha\beta\gamma}(\rho, \mathbf{p}, \mathcal{E}) &= \sum_i c_{i\alpha} c_{i\beta} c_{i\gamma} f_i^{(0)} \\
S_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}(\rho, \mathbf{p}, \mathcal{E}) &= \sum_i c_{i\alpha} c_{i\beta} c_{i\gamma} c_{i\delta} f_i^{(0)},
\end{aligned}$$

where Greek letters denote spatial indices. We also adopt notation for the traces of these tensors,

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_{\alpha\alpha}(\rho, \mathbf{p}, \mathcal{E}) &= 2\mathcal{E} \\
R_{\alpha\alpha\beta}(\rho, \mathbf{p}, \mathcal{E}) &= 2K_\beta(\rho, \mathbf{p}, \mathcal{E}) \\
S_{\alpha\alpha\beta\gamma}(\rho, \mathbf{p}, \mathcal{E}) &= 2L_{\beta\gamma}(\rho, \mathbf{p}, \mathcal{E}).
\end{aligned}$$

We have not shown and shall not show in this paper how to find a functional form for an equilibrium distribution with these moments. Suffice it to say that the need to be able to do this places well understood constraints on the lattice symmetry group [3]. This is why, for example, a triangular lattice is often used in two dimensions, and a face-centered cubic lattice is often used in three. Henceforth, we shall simply assume that the lattice is such that moments of the distribution transform like isotropic tensors to rank four.

IV. THE FIRST-ORDER SOLUTION

Taking moments of Eq. (3), we get the conservation equations

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_{t_1} \rho + \nabla \cdot \mathbf{p} &= 0 \\
\partial_{t_1} \mathbf{p} + \nabla \cdot \mathbf{Q} &= 0 \\
\partial_{t_1} \mathcal{E} + \nabla \cdot \mathbf{K} &= 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

These equations tell us how the conserved densities vary on the fastest (t_1) time scale. Since all of the moments are assumed to be functionally dependent on the conserved densities, we also know how they vary on the fastest time scale.

V. THE SECOND-ORDER SOLUTION

Taking moments of Eq. (4), we get the conservation equations

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_{t_2} \rho + \nabla \cdot \mathbf{p} &= \left(\tau - \frac{1}{2} \right) \nabla \cdot [\partial_{t_1}^2 \rho + 2\partial_{t_1} \nabla \cdot \mathbf{p} + \nabla \nabla : \mathbf{Q}] \\
\partial_{t_2} \mathbf{p} + \nabla \cdot \mathbf{Q} &= \left(\tau - \frac{1}{2} \right) \nabla \cdot [\partial_{t_1}^2 \mathbf{p} + 2\partial_{t_1} \nabla \cdot \mathbf{Q} + \nabla \nabla : \mathbf{R}] \\
\partial_{t_2} \mathcal{E} + \nabla \cdot \mathbf{K} &= \left(\tau - \frac{1}{2} \right) \nabla \cdot [\partial_{t_1}^2 \mathcal{E} + 2\partial_{t_1} \nabla \cdot \mathbf{K} + \nabla \nabla : \mathbf{L}]
\end{aligned}$$

Using the first-order solutions, Eqs. (5), to simplify the above, and converting to index notation, we have

$$\partial_{t_2}\rho + \nabla_\beta p_\beta = 0 \quad (6)$$

$$\partial_{t_2}p_\alpha + \nabla_\beta Q_{\beta\alpha} = \left(\tau - \frac{1}{2}\right) \nabla_\beta (\partial_{t_1}Q_{\beta\alpha} + \nabla_\gamma R_{\gamma\beta\alpha}) \quad (7)$$

$$\partial_{t_2}\mathcal{E} + \nabla_\beta K_\beta = \left(\tau - \frac{1}{2}\right) \nabla_\beta (\partial_{t_1}K_\beta + \nabla_\gamma L_{\gamma\beta}). \quad (8)$$

To proceed, we make use of the assumed functional dependence of $\mathbf{Q}$ and $\mathbf{K}$ on the conserved densities, ρ , $\mathbf{p}$ and $\mathcal{E}$. Using the chain rule and Eqs. (5), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{t_1}Q_{\beta\alpha} &= Q_{\beta\alpha,\rho}\partial_{t_1}\rho + Q_{\beta\alpha,p_\gamma}\partial_{t_1}p_\gamma + Q_{\beta\alpha,\mathcal{E}}\partial_{t_1}\mathcal{E} \\ &= -Q_{\beta\alpha,\rho}\nabla_\gamma p_\gamma - Q_{\beta\alpha,p_\gamma}\nabla_\delta Q_{\delta\gamma} - Q_{\beta\alpha,\mathcal{E}}\nabla_\gamma K_\gamma \\ &= -Q_{\beta\alpha,\rho}\nabla_\gamma p_\gamma - Q_{\beta\alpha,p_\gamma}(Q_{\delta\gamma,\rho}\nabla_\delta\rho + Q_{\delta\gamma,p_\xi}\nabla_\delta p_\xi + Q_{\delta\gamma,\mathcal{E}}\nabla_\delta\mathcal{E}) \\ &\quad - Q_{\beta\alpha,\mathcal{E}}(K_{\gamma,\rho}\nabla_\gamma\rho + K_{\gamma,p_\xi}\nabla_\gamma p_\xi + K_{\gamma,\mathcal{E}}\nabla_\gamma\mathcal{E}) \\ &= -(Q_{\beta\alpha,p_\gamma}Q_{\delta\gamma,\rho} + Q_{\beta\alpha,\mathcal{E}}K_{\delta,\rho})\nabla_\delta\rho \\ &\quad - (Q_{\beta\alpha,\rho}\delta_{\delta\xi} + Q_{\beta\alpha,p_\gamma}Q_{\delta\gamma,p_\xi} + Q_{\beta\alpha,\mathcal{E}}K_{\delta,p_\xi})\nabla_\delta p_\xi \\ &\quad - (Q_{\beta\alpha,p_\gamma}Q_{\delta\gamma,\mathcal{E}} + Q_{\beta\alpha,\mathcal{E}}K_{\delta,\mathcal{E}})\nabla_\delta\mathcal{E}, \end{aligned}$$

and likewise

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{t_1}K_\beta &= -(K_{\beta,p_\gamma}Q_{\delta\gamma,\rho} + K_{\beta,\mathcal{E}}K_{\delta,\rho})\nabla_\delta\rho \\ &\quad - (K_{\beta,\rho}\delta_{\delta\xi} + K_{\beta,p_\gamma}Q_{\delta\gamma,p_\xi} + K_{\beta,\mathcal{E}}K_{\delta,p_\xi})\nabla_\delta p_\xi \\ &\quad - (K_{\beta,p_\gamma}Q_{\delta\gamma,\mathcal{E}} + K_{\beta,\mathcal{E}}K_{\delta,\mathcal{E}})\nabla_\delta\mathcal{E}, \end{aligned}$$

where the commas denote differentiation ¹. Inserting these into Eqs. (7) and (8), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{t_2}p_\alpha + \nabla_\beta Q_{\beta\alpha} &= \left(\tau - \frac{1}{2}\right) \nabla_\beta \left(\mathcal{D}_{\beta\alpha\delta}^{\mathbf{p}\mathbf{p}}\nabla_\delta\rho + \mathcal{D}_{\beta\alpha\delta\xi}^{\mathbf{p}\mathbf{p}}\nabla_\delta p_\xi + \mathcal{D}_{\beta\alpha\delta}^{\mathbf{p}\mathcal{E}}\nabla_\delta\mathcal{E}\right) \\ \partial_{t_2}\mathcal{E} + \nabla_\beta K_\beta &= \left(\tau - \frac{1}{2}\right) \nabla_\beta \left(\mathcal{D}_{\beta\delta}^{\mathcal{E}\mathbf{p}}\nabla_\delta\rho + \mathcal{D}_{\beta\delta\xi}^{\mathcal{E}\mathbf{p}}\nabla_\delta p_\xi + \mathcal{D}_{\beta\delta}^{\mathcal{E}\mathcal{E}}\nabla_\delta\mathcal{E}\right), \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where we have defined the transport coefficients

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_{\beta\alpha\delta}^{\mathbf{p}\mathbf{p}} &\equiv R_{\delta\beta\alpha,\rho} - Q_{\beta\alpha,p_\gamma}Q_{\delta\gamma,\rho} - Q_{\beta\alpha,\mathcal{E}}K_{\delta,\rho} \\ \mathcal{D}_{\beta\alpha\delta\xi}^{\mathbf{p}\mathbf{p}} &\equiv R_{\delta\beta\alpha,p_\xi} - Q_{\beta\alpha,\rho}\delta_{\delta\xi} - Q_{\beta\alpha,p_\gamma}Q_{\delta\gamma,p_\xi} - Q_{\beta\alpha,\mathcal{E}}K_{\delta,p_\xi} \\ \mathcal{D}_{\beta\alpha\delta}^{\mathbf{p}\mathcal{E}} &\equiv R_{\delta\beta\alpha,\mathcal{E}} - Q_{\beta\alpha,p_\gamma}Q_{\delta\gamma,\mathcal{E}} - Q_{\beta\alpha,\mathcal{E}}K_{\delta,\mathcal{E}} \\ \mathcal{D}_{\beta\delta}^{\mathcal{E}\mathbf{p}} &\equiv L_{\delta\beta,\rho} - K_{\beta,p_\gamma}Q_{\delta\gamma,\rho} - K_{\beta,\mathcal{E}}K_{\delta,\rho} \\ \mathcal{D}_{\beta\delta\xi}^{\mathcal{E}\mathbf{p}} &\equiv L_{\delta\beta,p_\xi} - K_{\beta,\rho}\delta_{\delta\xi} - K_{\beta,p_\gamma}Q_{\delta\gamma,p_\xi} - K_{\beta,\mathcal{E}}K_{\delta,p_\xi} \\ \mathcal{D}_{\beta\delta}^{\mathcal{E}\mathcal{E}} &\equiv L_{\delta\beta,\mathcal{E}} - K_{\beta,p_\gamma}Q_{\delta\gamma,\mathcal{E}} - K_{\beta,\mathcal{E}}K_{\delta,\mathcal{E}}. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

These are the most general equations that we can obtain using the lattice Boltzmann method that we have described. Note that $\mathbf{Q}$ and $\mathbf{K}$ are determined by the desired momentum and energy fluxes. Eqs. (10) then give us differential equations for the moments $\mathbf{R}$ and $\mathbf{L}$ in terms of the conserved densities.

¹Thus, for example, $K_{\beta,\rho} \equiv \partial K_\beta / \partial \rho$.

VI. DESIRED THERMOHYDRODYNAMIC EQUATIONS

The equations of thermohydrodynamics can be written in conservative form as follows

$$0 = \partial_t \rho + \nabla \cdot (\rho \mathbf{u}) \quad (11)$$

$$0 = \partial_t (\rho \mathbf{u}) + \nabla \cdot (\rho \mathbf{u} \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{P}) \quad (12)$$

$$0 = \partial_t (\rho \varepsilon) + \nabla \cdot (\rho \mathbf{u} \varepsilon - \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{P} - k \nabla \iota) \quad (13)$$

where ρ is the density, $\mathbf{u}$ is the hydrodynamic velocity, ε is the total energy per unit mass, and

$$\iota \equiv \varepsilon - \frac{u^2}{2}$$

is the *internal* energy per unit mass. Also, we have defined

$$\mathbf{P} \equiv -P \mathbf{1} + \lambda (\nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}) \mathbf{1} + \mu \left[\nabla \mathbf{u} + (\nabla \mathbf{u})^T \right],$$

where P is the pressure.

Comparing the conserved densities in the above equations with those used in the last subsection, we see that the meaning of ρ is unchanged and that we must identify

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{p} &= \rho \mathbf{u} \\ \mathcal{E} &= \rho \varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

We also define the internal energy density,

$$I \equiv \rho \iota = \mathcal{E} - \frac{p^2}{2\rho},$$

and assume henceforth that the pressure $P(\rho, I)$ is a function only of the mass density and the internal energy density. Recasting Eqs. (11) through (13) in terms of ρ , $\mathbf{p}$ and $\mathcal{E}$ is then straightforward, and after some algebra we find

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t p_\alpha + \nabla_\beta \left(\frac{p_\beta p_\alpha}{\rho} + P \delta_{\beta\alpha} \right) &= \left(\tau - \frac{1}{2} \right) \nabla_\beta \left[\bar{\Lambda}_{\alpha\beta\delta\xi} \left(\nabla_\delta p_\xi - \frac{p_\xi}{\rho} \nabla_\delta \rho \right) \right] \\ \partial_t \mathcal{E} + \nabla_\beta \left[\frac{1}{\rho} (\mathcal{E} + P) p_\beta \right] &= \left(\tau - \frac{1}{2} \right) \nabla_\beta \left[\bar{\Lambda}_{\alpha\beta\delta\xi} \left(\nabla_\delta p_\xi - \frac{p_\xi}{\rho} \nabla_\delta \rho \right) \frac{p_\alpha}{\rho} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{\bar{k} \delta_{\beta\delta}}{\rho} \left(\mathcal{E} - \frac{p^2}{\rho} \right) \nabla_\delta \rho - \frac{\bar{k}}{\rho} \delta_{\beta\delta} p_\xi \nabla_\delta p_\xi + \bar{k} \delta_{\beta\delta} \nabla_\delta \mathcal{E} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

where we have defined

$$\bar{\Lambda}_{\alpha\beta\delta\xi} \equiv \bar{\lambda} \delta_{\alpha\beta} \delta_{\delta\xi} + \bar{\mu} \delta_{\beta\xi} \delta_{\delta\alpha} + \bar{\mu} \delta_{\alpha\xi} \delta_{\delta\beta}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\lambda} &\equiv \frac{\lambda}{(\tau - 1/2) \rho} \\ \bar{\mu} &\equiv \frac{\mu}{(\tau - 1/2) \rho} \\ \bar{k} &\equiv \frac{k}{(\tau - 1/2) \rho}. \end{aligned}$$

That is, we have incorporated the factor of $\tau - 1/2$ into the definitions of the barred transport coefficients to facilitate comparison of Eqs. (14) and (9). Henceforth, we assume that $\bar{\lambda}$, $\bar{\mu}$ and $\bar{k}$ are, like the pressure P , functions of the mass density ρ and internal energy density I only.

We can now identify the required momentum and energy fluxes,

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{\beta\alpha} &= \frac{p_\beta p_\alpha}{\rho} + P\delta_{\beta\alpha} \\ K_\beta &= \frac{p_\beta}{\rho} (\mathcal{E} + P). \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Thus, the second moments, $Q_{\alpha\beta}$, and the trace of the third moments, $R_{\alpha\alpha\beta} = 2K_\beta$, are completely determined in terms of the conserved densities. To proceed, we have to show that third and (traces of the) fourth moments with the required properties exist. Necessary and sufficient conditions for this are discussed in the next subsection.

VII. CONSISTENCY CONDITIONS

To determine the tensors $\mathbf{R}$ and $\mathbf{L}$, we compare Eqs. (14) and (9) to make the identification

$$\mathcal{D}_{\beta\alpha\delta}^{\mathbf{P}\rho} = -\frac{p_\xi}{\rho} \bar{\Lambda}_{\alpha\beta\delta\xi} \quad (16)$$

$$\mathcal{D}_{\beta\alpha\delta\xi}^{\mathbf{P}\mathbf{P}} = \bar{\Lambda}_{\alpha\beta\delta\xi} \quad (17)$$

$$\mathcal{D}_{\beta\alpha\delta}^{\mathbf{P}\mathcal{E}} = 0 \quad (18)$$

$$\mathcal{D}_{\beta\delta}^{\mathcal{E}\rho} = -\frac{p_\alpha p_\xi}{\rho^2} \bar{\Lambda}_{\alpha\beta\delta\xi} - \frac{\bar{k}\delta_{\beta\delta}}{\rho} \left(\mathcal{E} - \frac{p^2}{\rho} \right) \quad (19)$$

$$\mathcal{D}_{\beta\delta\xi}^{\mathcal{E}\mathbf{P}} = \frac{p_\alpha}{\rho} \bar{\Lambda}_{\alpha\beta\delta\xi} - \frac{\bar{k}p_\xi}{\rho} \delta_{\beta\delta} \quad (20)$$

$$\mathcal{D}_{\beta\delta}^{\mathcal{E}\mathcal{E}} = \bar{k}\delta_{\beta\delta}. \quad (21)$$

Hence, from Eq. (10) we have

$$\begin{aligned} R_{\delta\beta\alpha,\rho} &\equiv Q_{\beta\alpha,p_\gamma} Q_{\delta\gamma,\rho} + Q_{\beta\alpha,\mathcal{E}} K_{\delta,\rho} - \frac{p_\xi}{\rho} \bar{\Lambda}_{\alpha\beta\delta\xi} \\ R_{\delta\beta\alpha,p_\xi} &\equiv Q_{\beta\alpha,\rho} \delta_{\delta\xi} + Q_{\beta\alpha,p_\gamma} Q_{\delta\gamma,p_\xi} + Q_{\beta\alpha,\mathcal{E}} K_{\delta,p_\xi} + \bar{\Lambda}_{\alpha\beta\delta\xi} \\ R_{\delta\beta\alpha,\mathcal{E}} &\equiv Q_{\beta\alpha,p_\gamma} Q_{\delta\gamma,\mathcal{E}} + Q_{\beta\alpha,\mathcal{E}} K_{\delta,\mathcal{E}}, \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} L_{\delta\beta,\rho} &\equiv K_{\beta,p_\gamma} Q_{\delta\gamma,\rho} + K_{\beta,\mathcal{E}} K_{\delta,\rho} - \frac{p_\alpha p_\xi}{\rho^2} \bar{\Lambda}_{\alpha\beta\delta\xi} - \frac{\bar{k}\delta_{\beta\delta}}{\rho} \left(\mathcal{E} - \frac{p^2}{\rho} \right) \\ L_{\delta\beta,p_\xi} &\equiv K_{\beta,\rho} \delta_{\delta\xi} + K_{\beta,p_\gamma} Q_{\delta\gamma,p_\xi} + K_{\beta,\mathcal{E}} K_{\delta,p_\xi} + \frac{p_\alpha}{\rho} \bar{\Lambda}_{\alpha\beta\delta\xi} - \frac{\bar{k}p_\xi}{\rho} \delta_{\beta\delta} \\ L_{\delta\beta,\mathcal{E}} &\equiv K_{\beta,p_\gamma} Q_{\delta\gamma,\mathcal{E}} + K_{\beta,\mathcal{E}} K_{\delta,\mathcal{E}} + \bar{k}\delta_{\beta\delta}. \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

Since Eqs. (15) give the components of $\mathbf{Q}$ and $\mathbf{K}$ in terms of conserved densities, it follows that the entire right-hand sides of Eqs. (22) and (23) are known in terms of the conserved densities. Eqs. (22) and (23) then give the partial derivatives of $\mathbf{R}$ and $\mathbf{L}$, respectively, with respect to the three conserved densities. Thus, analyticity of $\mathbf{R}$ and $\mathbf{L}$ requires that all mixed second derivatives be symmetric; in addition, we must demand that the trace of $\mathbf{R}$ be equal to $2\mathbf{K}$, as required. The determination of the second derivatives is straightforward in principle but very tedious, being somewhat simplified by the assumption that P , $\bar{\lambda}$, $\bar{\mu}$ and $\bar{k}$ depend only on ρ and I . The results are presented in Appendix A. A glance at this appendix shows that, even accounting for the isotropy and symmetry under index interchange of $R_{\delta\beta\alpha}$ and $L_{\delta\beta}$ and of the second derivatives with respect to the momentum density, there are dozens of potentially independent requirements to be satisfied. It is therefore something of a minor miracle that all of these requirements can be reduced to the following six scalar conditions

$$0 = \bar{\mu}_{,\rho} + \frac{\bar{\mu} - P_{,\rho}}{\rho} \quad (24)$$

$$0 = \bar{\mu}_{,I} - \frac{P_{,I}}{\rho} \quad (25)$$

$$0 = \bar{\lambda}_{,\rho} + \frac{\bar{\lambda} + P_{,\rho}P_{,I}}{\rho} + \left(\frac{I+P}{\rho}\right) P_{,\rho,I} + P_{,\rho,\rho} \quad (26)$$

$$0 = \bar{\lambda}_{,I} + \frac{P_{,I}^2}{\rho} + \left(\frac{I+P}{\rho}\right) P_{,I,I} + P_{,\rho,I} \quad (27)$$

$$0 = \bar{\lambda} - \bar{\mu} + \left(\frac{I+P}{\rho}\right) P_{,I} + P_{,\rho} \quad (28)$$

$$0 = \bar{\lambda} - \bar{\mu} + \bar{k} + I\bar{k}_{,I} + \rho\bar{k}_{,\rho} \quad (29)$$

in *any* number of dimensions. The first pair of these, Eqs. (24) and (25), must be integrated for $\bar{\mu}$; analyticity then imposes a consistency condition on the mixed second derivatives of $\bar{\mu}$, but it is seen to be satisfied identically, and these equations then integrate to yield

$$\bar{\mu} = \frac{P}{\rho}. \quad (30)$$

Likewise, the second pair, Eqs. (26) and (27) for $\bar{\lambda}$, are automatically consistent with analytic $\bar{\lambda}$, and integrate to yield

$$\bar{\lambda} = \frac{P}{\rho} - P_{,\rho} - \left(\frac{I+P}{\rho}\right) P_{,I}. \quad (31)$$

The fifth equation, Eq. (28), is then satisfied identically. This leaves Eq. (29) which is a partial differential equation for the thermal conductivity; we shall return to this equation in a moment.

With the aid of Eqs. (30) and (31), Eqs. (22) can be integrated to get

$$R_{\delta\beta\alpha} = (\delta_{\beta\alpha}p_{\delta} + \delta_{\delta\alpha}p_{\beta} + \delta_{\delta\beta}p_{\alpha}) \frac{P}{\rho} + \frac{p_{\delta}p_{\beta}p_{\alpha}}{\rho^2}.$$

For $D = 3$, this result may be compared to Equation (8d) in the reference by McNamara [2]. We must now demand that the trace of this quantity be equal to twice the heat flux. We find

$$R_{\delta\beta\beta} = \left[(D+2)\frac{P}{\rho} + \frac{p^2}{\rho^2}\right] p_{\delta},$$

where $D = \delta_{\alpha\alpha}$ is the spatial dimension. Equating this with twice the heat flux, as given by Eq. (15), we arrive at

$$P = \frac{2}{D}I,$$

which is the ideal gas law ². From this, Eq. (30) immediately yields

$$\bar{\mu} = \frac{2I}{D\rho},$$

and Eq. (31) yields

²To see this in a more familiar form, note that the internal energy per unit mass is $I = \frac{D}{2}\rho k_B T/m$, so that $P = nk_B T$ where $n = \rho/m$ is the number density.

$$\bar{\lambda} = -\frac{4I}{D^2\rho}.$$

Returning to the thermal conductivity, it is straightforward to establish, e.g. using the method of characteristics, that Eq. (29) has the general solution

$$\bar{k} = \frac{2(D+2)}{D^2\rho} \left[I + f' \left(\frac{I}{\rho} \right) \right],$$

where f' is (the derivative of) an arbitrary function of its argument. Thus, we find that the model does have some flexibility in the choice of thermal conductivity. Using this result, it is now straightforward to integrate Eqs. (23) for the trace of the fourth moment, and the result is

$$L_{\delta\beta} = \frac{2(D+2)}{D\rho} \left\{ \frac{1}{D} \left[\left(I + \frac{Dp^2}{2(D+2)\rho} \right) I + \rho f \left(\frac{I}{\rho} \right) \right] \delta_{\delta\beta} + \frac{D+4}{D+2} \left(I + \frac{Dp^2}{2(D+4)\rho} \right) \frac{p_\delta p_\beta}{\rho} \right\}.$$

For $D = 3$ and $f = 0$ this may be compared to Equation (8c) in the paper by McNamara [2]. To the best of our knowledge, however, this form for $\mathbf{L}$ has never been written down for general D , or with the f term that allows some control of the thermal conductivity.

The “unbarred” forms of the transport coefficients are then,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu &= \frac{2}{D} \left(\tau - \frac{1}{2} \right) I \\ \lambda &= -\frac{4}{D^2} \left(\tau - \frac{1}{2} \right) I \\ k &= \frac{2(D+2)}{D^2} \left(\tau - \frac{1}{2} \right) \left[I + f' \left(\frac{I}{\rho} \right) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

We note that μ and λ are independent of ρ , while k depends on it only via the arbitrary function f . We see that the relation

$$\lambda = -\frac{2}{D}\mu$$

holds; when $D = 3$ this is approximately true for many real gases. The linear temperature dependence of λ and μ are, however, unrealistic; for real gases these go as $\sqrt{T}$. Finally, the Prandtl number is

$$\text{Pr} \equiv \frac{\mu}{k} = \frac{D}{D+2} \left[1 + \frac{f'(I/\rho)}{I} \right]^{-1}.$$

For $f = 0$, this reduces to the constant $D/(D+2)$ which is indeed equal to $1/2$ for the $D = 2$ example treated by Alexander et al. [1], and $3/5$ for the $D = 3$ example treated by McNamara [2] (when the relaxation times in the latter paper are set equal). More generally, however, the function f may be used to exercise some control over the Prandtl number.

VIII. CONCLUSIONS

We have presented a first-principles derivation of the lattice-BGK model of the ideal gas. In the process, we have established the necessity of the functional forms used for the shear and bulk viscosities, and have derived a somewhat more general form than is usually assumed for the thermal conductivity. We have also shown that the thermohydrodynamic model of the ideal gas is grossly overspecified, so that its existence is largely fortuitous. We have also shown that the unphysical dependence of the viscosities on temperature is an essential feature of the lattice-BGK model with constant relaxation time.

The cornerstone of our demonstration was nothing more than the demand of analyticity of the third moment and the trace of the fourth moment of the equilibrium distribution function. The main point of this paper is that it is essential to pay close attention to this criterion when using the “inverse Chapman-Enskog”

method of derivation of lattice Boltzmann models. It is a very fundamental and restrictive requirement which cannot be circumvented by different choices of lattice or of velocity set, or other superficial details. As noted earlier, allowing the relaxation parameter to depend on the hydrodynamic densities may be a way to recover some flexibility in this regard, but this possibility remains completely unexplored.

One of the principal outstanding problems in lattice Boltzmann research is the development of a thermodynamically consistent model that includes a soft interaction potential [4,5]. The ultimate solution to this problem will surely involve a radical departure from current lattice Boltzmann models – for example, by inclusion of some information about the two-particle distribution function. However it is solved, we expect that the form of the equilibrium distribution function involved will not be as easy to intuit as it is for the ideal gas. In that event, we expect that an approach similar to the one that was adopted in this paper will be useful.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to thank Frank Alexander and Julia Yeomans for helpful discussions, and Schlumberger Cambridge Research and NATO grant number CRG950356 for supporting this collaboration. BMB was supported in part by the United States Air Force Office of Scientific Research under grant number F49620-95-1-0285, and in part by AFRL.

REFERENCES

-
- [1] F.J. Alexander, S. Chen, J.D. Sterling, *Phys. Rev. E* **47** (1993) R2249-R2252.
 - [2] G.R. McNamara, B.J. Alder, *Physica A* **194** (1993) 218-228.
 - [3] D.H. Rothman and S. Zaleski, *Lattice-Gas Automata: Simple Models of Complex Hydrodynamics*, (Cambridge University Press, 1997).
 - [4] M.R. Swift, W.R. Osborn, J.M. Yeomans, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **75** (1995) 830-833.
 - [5] X.W. Shan, H. Chen, *Phys. Rev. E* **49** (1994) 2941-2948; **47** (1993) 1815-1819.

APPENDIX A: MIXED SECOND DERIVATIVES OF THE MOMENTS

The mixed second derivatives of the third moments and the trace of the fourth moments of the equilibrium distribution function can be calculated as described in Section 7. The results are

$$\begin{aligned}
R_{\delta\beta\alpha,\rho,p\xi} - R_{\delta\beta\alpha,p\xi,\rho} &= -(\delta_{\delta\beta}\delta_{\alpha\xi} + \delta_{\delta\alpha}\delta_{\beta\xi}) \left(\bar{\mu}_{,\rho} + \frac{\bar{\mu} - P_{,\rho}}{\rho} \right) \\
&\quad - \delta_{\delta\xi}\delta_{\beta\alpha} \left[\bar{\lambda}_{,\rho} + \frac{\bar{\lambda} + P_{,\rho}P_{,I}}{\rho} + \left(\frac{I+P}{\rho} \right) P_{,\rho,I} + P_{,\rho,\rho} \right] \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{\rho^2} \left\{ \left[\delta_{\delta\beta} \left(p_{\alpha}p_{\xi} - \frac{p^2}{2}\delta_{\alpha\xi} \right) + \delta_{\delta\alpha} \left(p_{\beta}p_{\xi} - \frac{p^2}{2}\delta_{\beta\xi} \right) \right] \left(\bar{\mu}_{,I} - \frac{P_{,I}}{\rho} \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \left[\delta_{\beta\alpha} \left(p_{\delta}p_{\xi} - \frac{p^2}{2}\delta_{\delta\xi} \right) \right] \left[\bar{\lambda}_{,I} + \frac{P_{,I}^2}{\rho} + \left(\frac{I+P}{\rho} \right) P_{,I,I} + P_{,\rho,I} \right] \right\} \\
R_{\delta\beta\alpha,\rho,\mathcal{E}} - R_{\delta\beta\alpha,\mathcal{E},\rho} &= -\frac{p_{\delta}}{\rho} \delta_{\beta\alpha} \left[\bar{\lambda}_{,I} + \frac{P_{,I}^2}{\rho} + \left(\frac{I+P}{\rho} \right) P_{,I,I} + P_{,I,\rho} \right] \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{\rho} (\delta_{\alpha\delta}p_{\beta} + \delta_{\beta\delta}p_{\alpha}) \left(\bar{\mu}_{,I} - \frac{P_{,I}}{\rho} \right) \\
R_{\delta\beta\alpha,p\xi,p_{\eta}} - R_{\delta\beta\alpha,p_{\eta},p\xi} &= +\frac{1}{\rho} [(\delta_{\delta\beta}\delta_{\alpha\eta} + \delta_{\beta\eta}\delta_{\delta\alpha})p_{\xi} - (\delta_{\delta\alpha}\delta_{\beta\xi} + \delta_{\delta\beta}\delta_{\alpha\xi})p_{\eta}] \left(\bar{\mu}_{,I} - \frac{P_{,I}}{\rho} \right) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{\rho} (\delta_{\delta\eta}\delta_{\beta\alpha}p_{\xi} - \delta_{\delta\xi}\delta_{\beta\alpha}p_{\eta}) \left[\bar{\lambda}_{,I} + \frac{P_{,I}^2}{\rho} + \left(\frac{I+P}{\rho} \right) P_{,I,I} + P_{,\rho,I} \right] \\
R_{\delta\beta\alpha,p\xi,\mathcal{E}} - R_{\delta\beta\alpha,\mathcal{E},p\xi} &= +\delta_{\delta\xi}\delta_{\beta\alpha} \left[\bar{\lambda}_{,I} + \frac{P_{,I}^2}{\rho} + \left(\frac{I+P}{\rho} \right) P_{,I,I} + P_{,I,\rho} \right] \\
&\quad + (\delta_{\beta\xi}\delta_{\alpha\delta} + \delta_{\alpha\xi}\delta_{\beta\delta}) \left(\bar{\mu}_{,I} - \frac{P_{,I}}{\rho} \right) \\
L_{\delta\beta,\rho,p\xi} - L_{\delta\beta,p\xi,\rho} &= +\frac{\delta_{\delta\beta}p_{\xi}}{\rho^2} \left\{ \left[\bar{k} + I\bar{k}_{,I} + \rho\bar{k}_{,\rho} - \mu - \rho\mu_{,\rho} - \left(\frac{I+P}{\rho} \right) P_{,I} \right] \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{p^2}{2\rho} \left(\bar{\mu}_{,I} - \frac{P_{,I}}{\rho} \right) \right\} \\
&\quad + \frac{\delta_{\delta\xi}p_{\beta}}{\rho^2} \left\{ \left[\bar{\mu} - \left(\frac{I+P}{\rho} \right) (P_{,I} + \rho P_{,\rho,I}) + \rho\bar{\lambda}_{,\rho} - P_{,\rho} \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. + P_{,I}P_{,\rho} + \rho P_{,\rho,\rho} \right] - \frac{p^2}{2\rho} \left[\bar{\lambda}_{,I} + \frac{P_{,I}^2}{\rho} + \left(\frac{I+P}{\rho} \right) P_{,I,I} + P_{,\rho,I} \right] \right\} \\
&\quad - \frac{\delta_{\beta\xi}p_{\delta}}{\rho^2} \left\{ \left[\bar{\lambda} + \left(\frac{I+P}{\rho} \right) P_{,I} + \rho\bar{\mu}_{,\rho} \right] + \frac{p^2}{2\rho} \left(\bar{\mu}_{,I} - \frac{P_{,I}}{\rho} \right) \right\} \\
&\quad - \rho^2 p_i p_j p_k \left[\bar{\lambda}_{,I} + \frac{P_{,I}^2}{\rho} + \left(\frac{I+P}{\rho} \right) P_{,I,I} + P_{,\rho,I} + \bar{\mu}_{,I} - \frac{P_{,I}}{\rho} \right] \\
L_{\delta\beta,\rho,\mathcal{E}} - L_{\delta\beta,\mathcal{E},\rho} &= -\frac{\delta_{\delta\beta}}{\rho} \left\{ \left[\bar{k} + I\bar{k}_{,I} + \rho\bar{k}_{,\rho} - \left(\frac{I+P}{\rho} \right) P_{,I} - P_{,\rho} \right] + \frac{p^2}{\rho} \left(\bar{\mu}_{,I} - \frac{P_{,I}}{\rho} \right) \right\} \\
&\quad - \frac{p_i p_j}{\rho^2} \left[\bar{\lambda}_{,I} + \frac{P_{,I}^2}{\rho} + \left(\frac{I+P}{\rho} \right) P_{,I,I} + P_{,\rho,I} + \bar{\mu}_{,I} - \frac{P_{,I}}{\rho} \right] \\
L_{\delta\beta,p\xi,p_{\eta}} - L_{\delta\beta,p_{\eta},p\xi} &= \frac{\delta_{\delta\xi}\delta_{\beta\eta} - \delta_{\delta\eta}\delta_{\beta\xi}}{\rho} \left[\bar{\lambda} - \bar{\mu} + \left(\frac{I+P}{\rho} \right) P_{,I} + P_{,\rho} \right]
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \frac{p_\delta (\delta_{\beta\eta} p_\xi - \delta_{\beta\xi} p_\eta)}{\rho^2} \left(\bar{\mu}_{,I} - \frac{P_{,I}}{\rho} \right) \\
& + \frac{p_\beta (\delta_{\delta\eta} p_\xi - \delta_{\delta\xi} p_\eta)}{\rho^2} \left[\bar{\lambda}_{,I} + \frac{P_{,I}^2}{\rho} + \left(\frac{I+P}{\rho} \right) P_{,I,I} + P_{,\rho,I} \right] \\
L_{\delta\beta,p_\xi,\mathcal{E}} - L_{\delta\beta,\mathcal{E},p_\xi} = & + \frac{1}{\rho} (\delta_{\delta\beta} p_\xi + \delta_{\beta\xi} p_\delta) \left(\bar{\mu}_{,I} - \frac{P_{,I}}{\rho} \right) \\
& + \frac{\delta_{\delta\xi} p_\beta}{\rho} \left[\bar{\lambda}_{,I} + \frac{P_{,I}^2}{\rho} + \left(\frac{I+P}{\rho} \right) P_{,I,I} + P_{,\rho,I} \right].
\end{aligned}$$